

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA)

Report Summary: No On-Site Visit

MSIP Year: 2002-2003

Total Number of Surveys:	Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC)			
Role of Person completing this survey:	Heart of Missouri-Columbia:	0	South Central Missouri:	2
Special Education Contact: 30	Southwest Missouri:	8	Southeast Missouri:	0
Superintendent: 2	Kansas City:	3	St. Louis:	0
Principal: 1	Northeast Missouri:	0	Central Missouri:	2
Other: 0	Northwest Missouri:	1		

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE					
1. SEMSA training workshops were helpful.	15	17	1	0	0
2. DESE provided timely and helpful responses to questions.	12	14	1	5	1
3. Compliance List Serv was helpful in answering questions.	6	14	9	4	0
B. WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS					
4. SEMSA instruction guidelines were helpful.	7	23	1	2	0
5. SEMSA instruction guidelines were user friendly.	5	22	2	2	2
C. SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS					
6. Data required to complete the self-monitoring review was easily accessible.	8	21	3	1	0
7. Amount of time required to complete the review was reasonable.	1	16	3	10	3
8. Electronic submission of data is an efficient way to send SEMSA data to DESE.	15	12	4	2	0
9. SEMSA process increased understanding of compliance requirements for special education.	12	18	1	2	0
10. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess student performance for students w/ disabilities.	1	13	5	10	4
11. SEMSA process has made district/agency more aware of performance of students w/disabilities.	2	15	5	8	3
12. SEMSA process helped accurately evaluate performance of students w/ disabilities.	0	11	6	12	4
13. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess compliance with state/federal regulations.	15	15	1	1	1
14. Time spent on the SEMSA process was beneficial.	6	16	7	1	3
D. FINAL REPORT AND LETTER					
15. Received final monitoring report/letter in reasonable length of time.	3	8	7	6	9
16. Final report/letter were user friendly.	3	11	12	5	2
E. CORRECTIVE ACTION/IMPROVEMENT PLANNING					
17. District/agency is aware of its areas of non-compliance.	11	13	8	1	0
18. District/agency is aware of what it needs to do to correct any areas of non-compliance.	12	11	6	4	4
F. ON-SITE PREPARATION AND VISIT					
19. Preparation for the on-site monitoring accomplished in reasonable amount of time.	0	1	1	0	0
20. On-site monitoring was beneficial.	1	0	1	0	0
21. On-site monitoring conducted in an efficient and effective manner.	1	0	2	0	0
22. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were knowledgeable.	1	0	2	0	0
23. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were professional.	0	0	2	0	0
24. DESE staff conducting the on-site monitoring were helpful.	0	0	2	0	0

25. How many staff were involved in the SEMSA self-monitoring review process?

Special Educators: 309 Administrators: 49 Support Staff: 37 Others: 21

26. How many total hours did it take to complete the SEMSA Review and Reporting:

Less than 20 hours: 0 21 to 30 hours: 6 31 to 40 hours: 8 More than 40 hours: 19

27. Did staff request assistance from a DESE special education Compliance supervisor during the SEMSA process?

Yes 28 No 5

Questions 28-31 are addressed on a separate report.